```
1
                     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                    FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
 2
 3
                                   CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:
    IN RE:
            VALSARTAN PRODUCTS
 4
    LIABILITY LITIGATION
                                   1:19-md-02875-RBK-JS
 5
                                   ORAL ARGUMENT
                                    (Via telephone)
 6
         Wednesday, May 13, 2020
 7
         Commencing at 4:00 p.m.
 8
    BEFORE:
                             THE HONORABLE JOEL SCHNEIDER,
                             UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
 9
    APPEARANCES:
10
         MAZIE SLATER KATZ & FREEMAN, LLC
         BY: ADAM M. SLATER, ESQUIRE
11
         103 Eisenhower Parkway
12
         Roseland, New Jersey 07068
         For the Plaintiff
13
         LEVIN PAPANTONIO
14
         BY: DANIEL A. NIGH, ESQUIRE
         316 S. Baylen, Suite 600
15
         Pennsacola, Florida 32502
         For the Plaintiff
16
         GOLOMB & HONIK PC
17
         BY: RUBEN HONIK, ESQUIRE
         1835 Market Street, Suite 2900
18
         Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
         For the Plaintiff
19
               Karen Friedlander, Official Court Reporter
20
                      friedlanderreporter@gmail.com
                             (856) 756-0160
21
             Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography;
22
          transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.
23
24
25
```

1	APPEARANCES: - CONTINUED
2	KANNER & WHITELEY LLC
3	BY: CONLEE S. WHITELEY, ESQUIRE 701 Camp Street
4	New Orleans, Louisiana 70130 For the Plaintiff
5	FARR LAW FIRM
6	BY: GEORGE T. WILLIAMSON, ESQUIRE 99 Nesbit Street
7	Punta Gorda, Florida 33950 For the Plaintiff
8	KIRTLAND & PACKARD LLP BY: BEHRAM PAREKH, ESOUIRE
9	1638 South Pacific Coast Highway
10	Redondo Beach, California 90277 For the Plaintiff
11	GOLDENBERG LAW PLLC
12	BY: MARLENE J. GOLDENBERG, ESQUIRE 800 Lasalle Avenue
13	Suite 2150 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402 For the Plaintiff
14	DUANE MORRIS LLP
15	BY: SETH A. GOLDBERG, ESQUIRE ALEXANDRA WALEKO, ESQUIRE
16	30 S. 17th Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
17	For the Defendant ZHP and the Joint Defense Group
18	PIETRAGALLO GORDON ALFANO BOSICK & RASPANTI LLP
19	BY: CLEM C. TRISCHLER, ESQUIRE One Oxford Centre, 38th Floor
20	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219 For the Defendant Mylan and the Joint Defense Group
21	GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP
22	BY: BRIAN H. RUBENSTEIN, ESQUIRE 3333 Piedmont Road, NE, Suite 2500
23	Atlanta, Georgia 30305 For the Defendants, Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.,
24	Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Actavis LLC, and Actavis Pharma, Inc.
25	

```
1
    APPEARANCES: - CONTINUED
 2
         BARNES & THORNBURG LLP
         BY: SARAH E. JOHNSTON, ESQUIRE
 3
         2029 Century Park East, Suite 300
         Los Angeles, CA 90067-2904
         For the Defendant, CVS Health Co.
 4
 5
         ULMER & BERNE LLP
         BY: JEFFREY DANIEL GEOPPINGER
 6
         600 Vine Street
         Suite 2800
 7
         Cincinnati, OH 45202
         For the Defendant, AmerisourceBergen
 8
 9
    ALSO PRESENT:
10
         Loretta Smith, Law Clerk
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
1
             (ALL PARTIES VIA TELEPHONE, May 13, 2020, 4:01 p.m.)
 2
             THE COURT: We're on the record in the matter of in
 3
    re Valsartan, MDL Docket 19-2875. Today is May 13, 2020.
    We're holding this status conference, discovery conference,
 4
 5
    what have you, via phone.
 6
             Why don't we just have the entries of appearances.
 7
    lot of people on the phone. Probably just the people who are
    going to talk, to enter their appearance, and for the benefit
 9
    of the court reporter, if anyone else is going to speak during
10
    this conference call, just say your name first, then we'll
11
    hear you. Anyone who wants to be heard of course will be
12
    heard.
13
             Who's on the line for the plaintiff?
14
             MR. SLATER: Hello, Your Honor, Adam Slater.
15
             MR. HONIK: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Ruben Honik.
16
             MR. WILLIAMSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor, this is
17
    George Williamson.
18
             MS. WHITELEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor, this is
19
    Conlee Whitely.
20
             MS. GOLDENBERG: This is Marlene Goldenberg.
21
             MR. PAREKH: This is Behram Parekh.
22
             THE COURT: Okay, how about just defendants.
23
             MR. GOLDBERG:
                           Your, Honor, for ZHP and the joint
24
    defense group, this is Seth Goldberg.
25
             MR. TRISCHLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Clem
```

```
1
    Trischler for Mylan Pharmaceuticals and the defendants'
 2
    executive pleading.
 3
             THE COURT: Okav. Great.
 4
             MS. JOHNSTON: Good afternoon, Your Honor this is
 5
    Sarah Johnston for the retailer defendants.
 6
             MR. GEOPPINGER: Good afternoon, Your Honor, this
 7
    Jeff Geoppinger, G-E-O-P-P-I-N-G-E-R, on behalf of the
 8
    wholesalers defendants and AmerisourceBergen.
 9
             THE COURT: Okay. Just to repeat --
10
             MR. RUBENSTEIN: And -- sorry. Brian Rubenstein from
11
    Greenberg Traurig for Teva and the defendants.
12
             THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
13
             MS. SMITH:
                         Judge and Karen, I don't think you need
14
    to record me. This is Loretta Smith.
15
             THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Loretta.
16
                    Counsel, I received your letters.
             Okay.
17
    appreciate it.
                    We'll discuss all the issues that you listed
18
    in the letter. If you'll just indulge me, there's just a
19
    couple of miscellaneous issues I just want to get out of the
20
    way before we get into your agenda. I wanted to start by
21
    saying understandably the case has been delayed a little bit
22
    in the progress of the case because of the crisis we're all
23
    dealing with. It's perfectly understandable. We're still
24
    dealing with an unusual situation, but we've all had enough
25
    time, I think, hopefully, to get back in the matter a little
```

bit. So the hope is we'll get the case back on track and pick up the momentum that we had before the crisis hit.

I just wanted to confirm with the parties what the Court's understanding is of what we have to look forward to in the upcoming foreseeable future. Just to summarize to make sure we're all on the same page, my notes indicate that May 15th, 2020, the defendants are going the produce the sales and pricing documents. If it hasn't already been done, the plaintiffs were going to identify priorities in terms of production. Defendants' rolling production of their documents is scheduled to start on July 15, 2020. Thereafter, rolling productions are going to be done on at least September 1st, October 1 and November 1, with a target date to complete the productions by November 29th, 2020.

So those are the deadlines that the Court noted. Of course we're going to discuss dealing with the ESI search terms and the briefing schedule requests. We'll deal with that on this phone call.

We have our conference scheduled for the end of the month. I know when we spoke with Judge Kugler, he indicated it might be an in-person conference. Obviously, I'm going to touch base with him and we'll see where we are, whether we're going to convert that to a phone conference or not. Just depends on developments as we go forward in the next week or two.

And the last thing was an issue that Loretta brought to my attention today. BrownGreer I think is keeping control and a record of all the cases and the information in the cases. One thing they're not getting, I understand, is a record of when cases are being dismissed. So is there a way that somehow they can be informed when a case is dismissed so they can note it for their records?

MR. PAREKH: Your Honor, this is Behram Parekh. We have asked Brown Grier to set up a system where the dismissing firm is supposed to check a box any time they dismiss their case. We will make sure that firms that have dismissed their cases know about that. We also have the ability to do that administratively as leadership and we will work to make sure that all of those are reflected correctly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Fantastic. So I think it's in all of our interests that they be kept up to date on the status of all the cases.

There were two more -- I'm looking at my notes.

There were two more miscellaneous issues before we get into the agenda. Have the parties hopefully, this is ZHP, worked out the Mandarin translation issue with the plaintiffs?

MR. GOLDBERG: I'm not sure. We did agree back in January on a set of Mandarin search terms. We are in the process of collecting the information and I believe Joe Ferretti from my office is in touch with Behram. I don't know

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
that there's any issue right now, but I suspect we'll be
discussing with plaintiffs any issues with respect to the
translated search terms.
         MR. PAREKH: Your Honor, this is Behram Parekh.
                                                          We
haven't encountered any issues so far. I've been in touch
with Mr. Ferretti about a few sort of discreet issues
regarding paper documents and things. We don't have anything
current.
         MR. SLATER: This is Adam Slater. I thought maybe
you were asking about translation for depositions.
what you were getting at?
         THE COURT: No, no, we haven't got into depositions
yet, Mr. Slater.
                 This is just about the documents.
         MR. SLATER: Okay.
         THE COURT:
                     I just want to -- if there's an issue,
counsel, I want to know about it, because going forward
hopefully we can avoid any delays that are caused by issues we
could work out now, instead of later.
         MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, I appreciate that.
are -- as I mentioned, we are in the midst -- we've been
collecting information from the various ZHP entities over the
last few weeks and are hopefully coming to the end of the
process of collecting and are trying to identify any issues as
we are doing that and raising them with Mr. Parekh, and we
```

intend to raise them as quickly as we can identify them with

```
1
   plaintiffs and then come to the Court with any that we can't
2
   resolve.
3
            THE COURT: Okay. It doesn't sound like there's any
4
   disputes to address now. But like I said, if there are
5
   disputes, we'd like to address them so they don't cause any
6
   delay.
7
            The other miscellaneous issue and the last one is
8
9
```

right before the crisis hit, there was an issue about the new foreign defendants who came in the case, Hetero and Aurobindo, and giving them a deadline for them to produce their core documents, and if they can't agree with plaintiffs on the relevant time discovery, to set that relevant time period for discovery like we did for the other parties.

Are those issues still left in the air?

MS. HUDSON: Your Honor, can you hear me?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. HUDSON: This is Lauren Hudson on behalf of plaintiffs. I've been in discussions with Hetero regarding some of the issues with respect to the more substantive discovery versus the core discovery. I don't believe we have — we just received today production of additional core discovery from Hetero and Aurobindo. I'm not — I would have to — I haven't had the opportunity to review that material yet, but we are in those discussions at least with Hetero and Aurobindo.

But as we said first to Hetero on a call weeks ago, we were still waiting on certain expects of their core discovery production, mainly the establishment inspection reports in order to identify things like key custodians -- in order to have more substantive negotiations regarding key custodians for the Indian Aurobindo and Hetero entities, we informed counsel that we really needed the production of establishment inspection reports that had been required as part of core discovery in order to have more fruitful discussions. I'm hopeful that perhaps some of the productions we received today from Hetero and Aurobindo included these documents so that we can sort of backtrack those discussions of custodians and relevant time period.

THE COURT: Counsel, here's what I -- I think we need to set this up preliminarily. One, I want to set a deadline when their core discovery is going to be complete; and two, I want to amend the existing order to set a relevant timeframe for these two entities to produce their discovery. I think I want to use the same -- we're going to use the same formula that we used for everyone else as to that, when they started producing this product, or something to that effect, and a year prior to that.

We don't need production of documents to get to the bottom of that. So I'm going to make a note by the next conference, the end of the month, I want to include that in

```
1
    the order.
 2
             So see if you can come to an understanding, an
    agreement on the relevant timeframe for these two entities.
 3
    If not, I'll set it, see if you can come to an agreement on
 4
 5
    when they're going to complete their core production
 6
    discovery, and if you don't come to an agreement, I'll just
 7
    set it.
 8
             MS. HUDSON: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
 9
             MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor this is Seth Goldberg.
10
    Just on that point, I don't know if counsel for Hetero or
11
    Aurobindo are on the line, and if not, then I'll certainly
12
    relay the message to them so that they can get in touch with
13
    plaintiffs and try to work these things out.
14
             MR. WRIGHT: Your Honor, this is Grant Wright.
15
    counsel for Hetero Labs in India and my co-counsel Nakul Shah
16
    is also on the line.
17
             THE COURT: Mr. Wright, I take it you understand the
18
    Court's directions to plaintiffs' counsel.
19
             MR. WRIGHT: Yes, Your Honor, we did, and the recent
20
    production that was made this week did include the EIR that
21
    counsel said that she was looking for.
22
             THE COURT: All right. So by the end of the month,
23
    we are going to set an outside date for the completion of the
24
    core discovery production, including the Court order, the
25
    relevant timeframe when you have to produce discovery, okay?
```

1 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Let's go to the agenda now. First issue, 3 ESI search terms. I'm aware of the dispute between the parties, of course I've read your letters. I have a couple of 4 5 I know Mylan questions before we hear any argument on this. 6 has taken the lead on this discussion and talked about why it 7 believes search terms need to be reduced. I haven't seen 8 anything specific to any other parties. Is the only 9 discussion that's ongoing is that having to do with Mylan? 10 MR. TRISCHLER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is Clem Trischler. 11 I can take, with the Court's permission, I 12 can take an initial crack at responding to the Court's 13 question, and if any of my colleagues want to add anything, 14 I'd certainly invite them, but we have taken the lead on 15 behalf of the defendants and have submitted information that 16 we believe is supportive of the request to amend the search 17 terms. Much of that information links to results that Mylan 18 has seen from searches that we have run. The counterproposal 19 that we initially submitted to plaintiff back in March to 20 revise the search terms, Judge, has since been adopted by all 21 of the manufacturing defendants with, you know, some small 22 exceptions. But for the most part, that original 23 counterproposal has been adopted by the group. I believe that 24 other defendants have submitted data to the plaintiffs, 25 including Teva, for instance, that outlines the volume of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

search that the documents, I should say, they're being captured by the search and the need for revisions. And so I think that it's fair to say that it's a collective response that up until this point has mostly been supported by data collected by Mylan, but our defendants are joining in the request.

THE COURT: How can the Court consider whether the search terms for someone other than Mylan could be changed if those parties haven't provided plaintiff with the information that plaintiffs need to evaluate their contention of overbroad and over burdensomeness?

MR. TRISCHLER: I think, Your Honor, what we had said at the meet and confer is to submit examples of what we've seen from running the searches, where the searches can be improved upon, where documents could be limited -- I think -or excuse me, where unnecessary production can be limited. think what Mylan has done is representative of what all the defendants have seen and I think that if we get to the motion stage, which I think, unfortunately, we are headed there, because I don't see this being resolved, acts of motion practice, I certainly recognize the Court's point and I think it's a fair point that that motion would have to be supported by evidence from all of the defendants if the Court was to modify their search terms globally. But I think we're prepared -- we will be prepared to do that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want to ask plaintiff, I note Mylan has THE COURT: provided some data. I know that plaintiffs contest that data. I've read the 44- or 45-page letter, but have plaintiffs received data from anyone besides Mylan to support a contention of overbreadth or overinclusiveness? MR. SLATER: Hello, Your Honor, it's Adam Slater. The only thing that was given was -- I think it might have been the last letter to the Court, some numbers were given by Teva on gross numbers of hits on documents as well as the gross numbers documents of, I believe, gross numbers of documents themselves. I think that is the only thing we've been provided, which is we've laid out in the letter is not sufficient for us to make any decision. And just so you know, Your Honor, also as Mr. Parekh said, he's on, and we also have our ESI lead discovery expert on, Mr. Jaffe, in case there are any technical questions we wanted to be able to be as responsive as possible to Your Honor today on this call. So he's on with us. THE COURT: The other question I had, before we open up the floor for any argument on this issue, I did a little bit of investigation and background work before this call to prepare for this call, a look at the record regarding the ESI search terms. We know about the Court's order in December, attaching Exhibit H, which was the agreed-upon search terms.

I've read through the transcripts of the arguments. All the

objections were ruled upon. There were relatively few of them.

The procedure that the Court approved and blessed was in appendix -- or Exhibit H and in Mr. Slater's December 10, 2019 letter, Docket No. 316 at Pages I think 8 to 10, I'm not a hundred percent positive if this is incorporated into the court-approved exhibit, but there was some sort of discussion in Mr. Slater's letter about some sort of protocol for testing and if too many documents showed up, they would work on this and work on that.

My question was, is the party's present dispute under the procedure that the parties agreed, or is this something new that the defendants are raising, and why isn't the protocol or procedure that the parties agreed upon being followed?

MR. SLATER: Your Honor, again it's Adam Slater. If I recall, and I don't have the document in front of me, but my recollection is that we were asking to have testing done while we were developing the search terms, and the defense did not want to do that. They said they were comfortable that the search terms were reasonable and they did not want to do testing and sampling as we negotiated, which is something that's often done, as Your Honor is well aware.

As Your Honor knows, afterwards, after the terms were established and we've laid it out in the letter, only Mylan

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

16

We never contemplated that the defense would take this long, give us dribs and drabs of information and then ultimately come to us with what we think is a very substantial materially changed set of search terms and we've laid out in the letter why it is so incredibly prejudicial and based on inadequate methodology and then -- and do that in the face of not having done most of the relevant and necessary sampling of testing that would be needed, all of which would need to happen, for example, after de-duplication and e-mail threading, et cetera.

So, what we were contemplating never in a million years did we contemplate the process the defense has proposed to us, and just to foreshadow, not that there's any surprise, Mr. Trischler is talking about robust or heavy motion practice. Our request is going to be for the Court to shut this down completely so we can move on where the document productions are supposed to be imminent and we now have a concession that they hadn't even put the documents on their vendor's platforms yet. We feel like in light of where things are that it's far too late to start such a briefing process,

and that in light of what we've presented, we've established that the search terms should just be run.

(Cross talk)

THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Trischler. You'll get every opportunity to be heard, but I don't think, Mr. Slater -- you probably don't have the letter in front of you, so you weren't referring to what the Court is referring to.

In your December 10th, 2019 letter, I have it in front of me, Page 8, this is what it says, quote: The parties have devised and agreed upon the attached -- upon the detailed method described below for further evaluating disputed search terms while simultaneously reviewing and producing noncustodial documents and documents resulting from undisputed search terms, period, close quote.

Okay. This is on December 10, talks about the standalone terms, manufacturing medical conditions, economic terms, entities, et cetera. So there was a procedure that was agreed upon that if there was a dispute as to certain terms or certain issues, this is how the parties were going to work it out.

My question was whether what defendants had raised now is pursuant to what was agreed upon as set forth in this December 10 letter, or as I suspect you're contesting -- or intending, excuse me, it's just a new issue that you didn't anticipate.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SLATER: Right. I'm going to hand this to Mr. Parekh in a second, but it's my understanding now that you've read that, and I appreciate that, Your Honor. That is what I was saying a moment ago is, what happened in January is what is contemplated, where they came to us and said, you know, we have a problem with this and it's recited in our letter that we sent which was attached to the Court, and they had a problem with a few different things and we spoke to them about it and a few things we thought got worked out and then one of them we never got a response on the other drug names issues. That's how we thought it would proceed, but again, what you just read is, that was supposed to happen while they were processing all the documents and producing documents to us and as they saw an issue talking to us. That is not what's contemplated by that letter, and I'll defer to Mr. Parekh if he wants to, you know, supplement that, because he's very

MR. PAREKH: Sorry, Your Honor.

involved in this was well.

THE COURT: I wanted to hear from you before we go to Mr. Trischler.

MR. PAREKH: Sure, Your Honor. I was the person who negotiated this with Mr. Ferretti from ZHP's counsel, and the purpose of the procedure was to -- as defendants were collecting and searching these documents and they ran across

specific issues with search terms or with a specific search term and, you know, we had some discreet issues that we could work out, that that was the procedure to be followed and we identified, you know, the categories where we thought some of these things might come up and where we thought that we could work things out in that procedure.

It was never contemplated by either party, and I apologize, I don't believe Mr. Ferretti is on the phone, but, I mean, the thought was never from our perspective at least that we would have to do a complete and wholesale revision as the the entire process as agreed to search terms, which is what Mr. Trischler proposed back in March. What we thought we were going to do was exactly what they proposed in January, which is they identified five or six discrete issues and we would work those out and figure out how to deal with those.

But the problem that we're having is, you know, they're essentially starting over from scratch at this point and trying to renegotiate virtually everything, including how the modifiers worked across the board. And that is not what that procedure was designed for.

THE COURT: Okay. Let's hear from Mr. Trischler.

MR. TRISCHLER: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Clem Trischler. And I think the Court began this discussion by raising a very fair and meaningful question, and I'll address it head on. And essentially what you asked, Your Honor, is

the procedure that we formalized with the counterproposal in March, what was contemplated by the Court's order, and the answer is absolutely yes.

And Your Honor mentioned the December 23 order, it's Docket No. 328, and the procedure for the search terms is outlined on Pages 55, 56, and 57 of that order. It talks about a number of things, but on Page 55 of Docket 328, one of the things it talks about are the standalone search terms. And what the order itself states is, quote: The following terms have remained on the stand-alone terms list, but can be tested and refined further if needed and as shown.

That's precisely what we did with a number of the standalone terms in the counterproposals, precisely what is contemplated in that order, Your Honor.

Another thing that we did, if you go to the next page of that order, the parties had long discussions about search terms related to establishment inspection reports, Form 483s. How those terms were to be handled was specifically called out in the December 23 order, and what the order states is that again with respect to these documents when used against data of custodians in management, these search terms will be run as standalone terms but can be tested and refined further if needed.

And again, we ran the searches as contemplated and have demonstrated a need for it and have brought that first to

the attention of the plaintiffs and now to the Court.

And lastly, Judge, you know, this has been constantly portrayed and I think it's a bit of a false narrative is that when this order was entered in December, that it was a fait accompli, that this is how it's all going to be perceived, and that was never the case.

If we go again to Page, I believe it's 57 of Docket 328, there were 31 terms completely objected to by the defendants, and those terms -- Your Honor mentioned that you had a chance to read the 41-page exhibit that the plaintiffs attached to their agenda that we only served yesterday. Many of those objections or terms are highlighted in yellow if Your Honor went through and read that. And what was agreed to and what was ordered with respect to those terms was that the defendants will run hit counts against the search string agreed upon for each term highlighted in yellow, and if there's a need to amend them, the parties would meet and confer on how to do that. That's again precisely what we've done.

So I submit to the Court that what the defendants have done here is follow to a T what was contemplated in the December 23 order.

The plaintiffs' objection appears to be that it's not happened as rapidly as they would like, but we raised issues in January. The issues we raised with them in January were,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
you know, were handled mostly by attorneys in my office and
was, frankly, Judge, the low hanging fruit that we started
with. We raised it again in February and we submitted the
counterproposal in March and we are following the protocol in
the process and it's spelled out in the order, and the
counterproposal that we submitted was covered precisely, the
terms and the manner in which the Court and the parties agreed
to back in December.
         MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, this is Seth Goldberg.
Can I just weigh in on one point with respect to ZHP?
         THE COURT:
                     Sure.
         MR. GOLDBERG: Which is simply that ZHP is in the
midst of applying the search terms to collect the information
and we fully intend to follow the process that was agreed upon
in December. Due to the coronavirus, we did not have the
chance to test any terms in January, February, March, and
April, but we fully intend to do that now and to utilize this
process. But I can say that given Mylan's results and given
that ZHP has almost twice as many custodians, we fully
anticipate that there's going to be a lot of false -- a lot of
false positives with the search terms and we need to have the
opportunity to work through this process.
         THE COURT: Well, let me say this. We'll brief the
issue somehow, but the Court has already indicated that this
dispute will not, repeat "not" stay the deadlines that the
```

Court has imposed. The current deadline for the defendants to start their rolling production of responsive documents is July 15th. That deadline is cast in stone. So whether or not we revise the search terms, it does not stay or delay that deadline. There are certainly categories and terms and connecters, what have you, that are not in dispute. They have to be applied, and the undisputed documents have to be produced.

When the Court agreed to the deadlines that defendants proposed, it obviously took into account the crisis we're in, and even though it was pretty liberal, liberal deadlines over plaintiffs' objections, we put them in place and the Court had indicated that it's not going to stay those deadlines or delay those deadlines any further, except if we have some unforeseen crisis like this corona crisis we're going through. This dispute over search terms is not the sort of unanticipated event that will work to delay the Court's deadlines.

So, Mr. Trischler, I want to put it in your hands. You tell me. If we go through a formal motion practice, the earliest I'm going to decide the issue is the middle of June, okay? The July 15 deadline is not changing, so we can do it on letter briefs, we'll get a schedule and I'll decide it when we get together in two weeks. You know, what do you prefer?

MR. TRISCHLER: Well, Your Honor, I thank you for

giving me the option. I would like, since this affects more than just my client, I'd like some time to --

THE COURT: We've got to decide it today. We're deciding it today. I'm not delaying this. If you don't want to decide it, I'll decide it. I mean, you're either going to get an answer on the 27th or the 17th of June. If I decide it on the 17th of June, it gives you less than 30 days to make the first fulsome rolling production. If I decide it on the 27th, it gives your client 45 days to make that fulsome first production. What do you --

MR. TRISCHLER: I am fine either way, Judge. If the there is another defendant that feels as strongly about it, I would like someone to make a suggestion, but I'm fine with whatever the Court wants to order.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, Mr. Goldberg, you want to weigh in?

MR. GOLDBERG: Yeah, I do want to weigh in on this specific point that -- for ZHP, because ZHP is in a different position than the defendants on this. Here we have not had the opportunity to do what Mr. Parekh says this was intended to, which is to work with plaintiffs to know the list based on the information we are getting as we are conducting the searches. And we have not, ZHP, due to the coronavirus, has not been given the opportunity to use this agreed-upon method, and it's almost like we are now being punished in a way

because of the coronavirus.

I don't know if the search term -- I'll give you an example that I do know of. One of the search terms is the name Wang, because there is an FDA inspector named Wang, and surely at ZHP we have dozens of Wangs that are coming up in the searches. But because we're only in the midst of this now, we have not been able to go to plaintiffs with these issues and I -- we joined with the defendants in the notion that the search terms are overly broad and need to be revised. But for ZHP, we need to have the opportunity to use the process that the parties agreed upon and that the court endorsed.

THE COURT: Here is the Court's order, that by
May 27th defendants file one motion asking to change the
search terms. I'm not dealing with generic issues. Each
defendant is going to have to show good cause why they think
the search terms should be changed. Plaintiff will respond on
June 10th and I'll decide the issue on June 17th, okay?
Plaintiffs want to reply on June 15, that's okay. I'll decide
the issue on June 17, but the July 15 date is not changing,
counsel, so just keep that in mind. We're going to start to
get these documents rolling in the case. I gave the
defendants exactly what they asked for, July 15, and we'll
stick with it, okay?

MR. TRISCHLER: Understood, Your Honor. Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
I'm just making a note. Okay. Next
        THE COURT:
issue is defendants' fact sheets. Are you still working on
that? Is the only dispute whether the defendants are going to
have to provide Bates numbers for specific document requests?
        MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, right now, if you're
referring to the manufacturer defendant fact sheets --
        THE COURT: Yes, exactly.
        MR. GOLDBERG: Yeah. The Court issued an order
setting the parameters for what the manufacturer defendant
fact sheets need to be. We revised the defendants' fact
sheets according to the order, gave the plaintiffs the revised
set. We just received back from them edits to our proposal
last night. So, we're going to try to work with plaintiffs on
this and hopefully, you know, either be able to bring to Your
Honor any remaining disputes at the end of the month or have
an agreement.
        THE COURT: Okay, great. We will finalize those on
the 27th. Is that okay, Mr. Slater?
        MR. SLATER: Absolutely, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: Okay. Prioritization of document ESI
discovery. I think I saw a letter indicating that that was
done. Am I right?
        MR. SLATER: We have sent a letter to the defense
after having a conference with them and speaking to them and
they have in their hands our requests. We don't know what the
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
defense response is to whether they intend to accommodate it,
but what I guess, you know, our assumption is they will,
unless they tell us to the contrary.
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. GOLDBERG: Your Honor, we received the letter and
I believe it was on Monday or maybe it was Friday of last
week, and we'll evaluate the letter and get back to plaintiffs
on it.
         THE COURT: Okay. You'll let us know if there is any
objections for the 27th conference.
         Next issue is the briefing schedule.
                                              I've
communicated with Judge Kugler, counsel. The dates that the
parties proposed are agreeable. You caught Judge Kugler on a
good day. He's going to give you more pages, but not as many
as you asked.
             I'm just looking for his e-mail. Bear with me.
Bear with me one second, counsel. Here it is. As I
understand it, it's going to be three motions, each one
directed to one of the complaints. Is that right?
         MR. GOLDBERG: No, Your Honor, that is not our
intention. Our intention is to have three motions, one on
behalf of --
         THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry.
         MR. GOLDBERG:
                       Yeah, go ahead.
         THE COURT: One on behalf of each group, right?
        MR. GOLDBERG: Right. It's going to be supply chain
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
specific with probably the manufacturer defendant brief will
address common issues that can be resolved across all of the
levels of the supply chain, with the wholesaler brief dealing
with wholesaler unique issues, and the retailer brief dealing
with retailer-specific issues.
         THE COURT: Right. So he said 80 pages for the
opening brief, 80 pages for the reply brief -- for the
response brief and 40 pages for the reply brief. And I gotta
tell you, that's the most pages I've ever seen Judge Kugler
       So you got a him in a good mood.
         MR. GOLDBERG: I trust, Your Honor, we can use those
pages as we see fit across the three briefs.
         THE COURT: You mean make one brief a hundred, and
one --
         MR. GOLDBERG: No. So he's thinking 80 pages for
each of the briefs.
         THE COURT: Yeah. What were you thinking?
         MR. GOLDBERG: Well, we were thinking of having --
when we made our proposal for 120 pages, we were thinking
120 pages total for the three briefs. One might be 60, one
might be 40, the other might be --
         THE COURT: Oh, okay. Oh, I see. No, that would be
       80 total for the three would be great.
         MR. GOLDBERG: Well, I think, you know, we would
prefer to have 120 total or a hundred total. I think it would
```

1 be very hard for us to do all three with 80 total. 2 THE COURT: Counsel, you'll have to take it up with Judge Kugler because that's what he directed. 3 4 MS. SMITH: Judge Schneider, this is Loretta. I was 5 listening to some confusion and I will take it to Judge 6 Kugler. 7 MR. HONIK: Your Honor, this is Ruben Honik, if I 8 I was the one principally meeting and conferring with 9 Mr. Goldberg about these matters, and candidly, we -- I had 10 proposed what I thought the Court had initially said, which is 11 to say one brief for each of the three master complaints which 12 would be the conventional way in which Rule 12 motions are 13 brought. I'm just wondering, maybe aloud at this point, 14 whether there may be some unnecessary confusion if its really 15 done across the type of defendant in question. 16 So, for example, are we to expect that the 17 manufacturers are going to file a single omnibus Rule 12 18 motion that cuts across medical monitoring, economic class, 19 and bodily injury issues? And I'm wondering if there 20 shouldn't be a directive to -- for the defendants to confine 21 themselves to the 80 pages proposed by Judge Kugler and to 22 have an omnibus motion for each of the complaints. 23 So, for example, as to the economic class complaints, 24 which comprise the consumer economic claims and the TPP 25 claims, that each of the defendants in an omnibus single

motion bring whatever Rule 12 issue they want to bring and similarly for each of the other complaints. That's what we had proposed to Mr. Goldberg, and initially, they had proposed to us a total of a hundred pages and in the most recent conferral they bumped it up to 120 pages.

But I think both issues are relevant, that is, the number of total pages and how the issues are divided so that they can be digested in the most sensible way by the parties, but certainly by the Court as well.

And we just think it makes sense to do it by each of the master complaints.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Goldberg, is what you envision -take the economic complaint. Do you envision that there would
be three motions to dismiss -- that portions of three motions
to dismiss, three separate -- okay, trying to get this
straight.

Each of the three groups would file a motion to dismiss portions of the economic complaint directed to them.

MR. GOLDBERG: Our proposal would be, it would be three briefs. One would be filed by the manufacturer defendants. That brief would discuss the factual allegations and the claims that are pertinent to all of the manufacturer defendants and that are also pertinent to the wholesalers and the retailers.

Then the wholesalers would file a motion that would

be limited to those claims and factual allegations that are truly unique to the wholesalers, such as the Drug Supply Act, or innocent seller statutes. Similarly, the retailers would have a brief that would be focused on retailer-specific issues so that the Court when it's revealing the motions to look at the manufacturer defendants' brief and say, okay, here's the bulk of the issues, here are the common issues, the common allegations across our supply chain and I can rule on these issues and I know I'm covering the manufacturer defendants, and to the extent those issues are common, the wholesalers and retailers, I can decide that.

But if the Court wants to focus only on the wholesaler issues, it can look at the wholesaler brief, and if the Court wants to focus on the retailer issues, it can look at the retailer brief.

And the reason we propose that is because the parties of the different levels of the supply chain have different duties and obligations and different defenses based on those duties and obligations. And it doesn't -- it doesn't make sense to have a motion to dismiss that deals with all of those duties and obligations as to the personal injury claim and then repeat that in large part as to the economic loss claims and then repeat that in large part as to the medical monitoring. And I say "repeat that," because by and large, the three master complaints, they assert many of the same

claims, and of course they share many of the same factual allegations.

But what the Court's dealing on this motion to dismiss is evaluating independently the different duties and obligations and different defendants that each level of the supply chain has. And we think that the most efficient way for the Court to do that is to look at them at each level on a stand-alone basis, and that's exactly what the Court's been doing through this entire litigation, acknowledging different levels of the supply chain have different duties and obligations.

THE COURT: Okay. So might it be the case, say, for example, it doesn't matter which group, let's take the retailers, that their motion might be divided into three sections? First section would be directed to the relevant portions of the personal injury complaint that they want to dismiss, then the medical monitoring, and then the economic? So there might be three sections in each of the three motions to dismiss?

MR. HONIK: Possibly, or another way to do it would be in the manufacturing defendant brief, for us to be saying something like, okay, now, motion to dismiss breach of express warranty, this claim is assertive in all three complaints and so the Court can decide it, as you decide it one time as to all three complaints.

But what we would do is streamline each brief to make sure that the Court isn't doing duplicative work.

THE COURT: Mr. Honik, let me stop you there. I know it's a little unusual, but I think in the context of this case what Mr. Goldberg is proposing makes sense. Rather than dealing with the separate complaint, deal with the claims of each of the three groups, because I think he's correct that at least in handling the case, and I think that would make it easier for Judge Kugler to decide, you can settle the manufacturing issues at one time, all the retailer issues at one time, all the wholesaler issues at one time and I think that might be a little bit easier than dealing with all the complaints.

MR. GOLDBERG: Judge, this is Seth Goldberg. Sorry. (Cross talk)

THE COURT: Getting back to the pages, Mr. Goldberg, let me confer with Judge Kugler. But can we just understand again what you're proposing? Let's use -- it doesn't -- use 80 pages. Suppose Judge Kugler says 80 pages. You're saying that all of the motions or briefs should add up to 80 pages, not each one can be 80 pages, is what what you're saying?

MR. GOLDBERG: Correct, correct. And what we had proposed was that in given the number of defendants' number of issues, what we had proposed was a total of 120 pages for

these three briefs so that they would all add up, all

```
1
    together, the first round of briefing would be 120 pages and
 2
    plaintiffs would have --
 3
             THE COURT: Here's my question, Mr. Goldberg. You
    would know this better than me, because luckily, I don't file
 4
 5
    motions anymore, but doesn't the local rules give each party
 6
    40 or 45 pages? So why do you need leave to serve more pages?
 7
             MR. GOLDBERG: Well, right. I mean, the briefing one
 8
    that is 40 pages when here, each party -- there are 50 parties
 9
    so you would presumably have a lot more pages, each party
10
    would be entitled to 40.
11
             THE COURT: No, no, no.
12
             MR. GOLDBERG: So what we're doing at -- right.
13
    what we're doing at 120 pages is saying, you know, each level
14
    of the supply chain would potentially have 40 pages.
15
    just trying to find a total number of pages that would allow
16
    us the opportunity to make all of the arguments for all of the
17
    defendants as to all of the claims.
             THE COURT: I'm confused because --
18
                         Judge Schneider, I'm sorry to interrupt
19
             MS. SMITH:
20
         May I ask Mr. Goldberg a question?
21
             Mr. Goldberg, this is Loretta Smith. Hi. If the
22
    total number of pages of your omnibus motion for all three
23
    kinds of defendants, if there's 120 pages and your proposal is
24
    that you would be able to determine what number of pages you
25
    could use to write up, for example, the manufacturers' MTD.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And a concern might be, I can anticipate Judge Kugler's question, is that, you know, might it be that you could consider a limit, or let's say the manufacturers' MTD, Mr. Goldberg, because I think, you know, an 80-page MTD brief for the manufacturers is something that would be a question for Judge Kugler. MR. GOLDBERG: Sure. I'd like -- we want -- we are flexible in terms of, you know, is it 80, 100, 120. We just need the total number of pages to be able to make all of these different arguments on behalf of all of the different defendants. And if it were, you know, 50 pages for the manufacturers and 30 and 30 so that you have a total of 110, that would be fine. If the Court wants to limit the entire set to 80 pages and says, okay, defendants, you have 80 pages for these -- total for these three briefs, then, you know, we'll live with that. It will be hard because there are so many different arguments that need to be raised. But all we're at -- we will live with -- if that makes sense for Judge Kugler, then we can live with that. If the Court wants to say, you know, three

briefs at 40 pages each, so that each level of the supply

what we're trying to do is by -- we think the manufacturer

brief needs to be longer because it's going to take on the

chain is getting the amount allowable under the rules.

```
1
    common issues.
 2
             So, you know, we would say 50, 30 and 30, and that
 3
    way, you know -- and maybe that's the outer limit for the
    manufacturer defendant brief and each of the other two briefs
 4
    get to be 30 pages.
 5
 6
                         Thank you.
             MS. SMITH:
 7
             THE COURT: Okay. Loretta, would you just touch base
 8
    with Judge Kugler and get back to me?
 9
             MS. SMITH:
                         I will.
10
             THE COURT: Okay. We'll get back to you, counsel, on
11
                     Thanks for verifying that.
    how many pages.
12
             Next issue on the agenda was the plaintiffs' fact
13
    sheet deficiencies. I suppose we're going to hear more about
14
    that on the 27th.
15
             MS. GOLDENBERG: Yes, Your Honor. This is Marlene
16
    Goldenberg for the plaintiffs. We had a productive meet and
17
    confer earlier this week where I think we were able to come to
18
    an agreement on most issues. We have been told by the
19
    defendants that we can expect to see a revised list of alleged
20
    deficiencies in advance of the next conference, and if we
21
    can't work through those, then they'll submit a list of cases
22
    to use for a show cause order and then let you know at that
23
    time if we have any issues with it.
24
             THE COURT: No problem.
25
             Anything with the short form complaint?
```

Ms. Rebecca: Yes, Your Honor, this is Alex Ruecka						
from Duane Morris on behalf of ZHP and the defendants. There						
is no current dispute about the short form complaints. We						
just raise that issue in our agenda to inform the Court that						
we had agreed to extend the deadline for fixing the short form						
complaints from March 23rd to May 20th so that we can review						
any that remaining deficient at the end of this month.						
THE COURT: Perfect.						
Last issue on the agenda, was the downstream						
briefing. I understand the situation we're in, and the						
briefing schedule extension is approved June 16th for the next						
brief. Response brief on June 22nd. So barring unforeseen						
circumstances, we'll argue those the end of June and hopefully						
get those decided at the same time.						
Okay. That takes us through the agenda. Are there						
any other issues that anyone would like to raise or discuss?						
MR. GOLDBERG: Nothing from defendants, Your Honor.						
MR. SLATER: Nothing from the plaintiffs, I don't						
think, Your Honor.						
MS. WHITELEY: Your Honor, this is Conlee Whitely. I						
do have one thing that we wanted to add to the agenda, if the						
you can indulge me.						
THE COURT: Yes.						
MS. WHITELEY: We just wanted to let the Court know						
that we're going to be filing in the next couple of days a						

-			•	
/	29th [1] - 6:14	856 [1] - 1:20	25:11, 37:5	attention [2] - 7:2,
,			agreed-upon [2] -	21:1
/S [1] - 38:19	3	9	14:24, 24:24	attorneys [1] - 22:1
	20	00007.0004	agreement [5] - 11:3,	Aurobindo [6] - 9:9,
0	30 [7] - 2:16, 24:7,	90067-2904 [1] - 3:3	11:4, 11:6, 26:16,	9:22, 9:25, 10:6,
07068 [1] - 1:12	35:12, 36:2, 36:5 300 [1] - 3:3	90277 [1] - 2:9 99 [1] - 2:6	36:18	10:11, 11:11
07000 _[1] - 1.12	30305 [1] - 2:22	99[I] - 2.0	ahead [2] - 5:12, 27:23 aided [1] - 1:22	Avenue [1] - 2:12 avoid [1] - 8:17
1	31 [1] - 21:8	Α	aided [1] - 1.22 air [1] - 9:14	aware [2] - 12:3, 15:23
,	316 _[2] - 1:14, 15:5		Alex [1] - 37:1	awarc [2] 12.0, 10.20
1 [2] - 6:13	32502 [1] - 1:15	ability [1] - 7:12	ALEXANDRA [1] -	В
10 [4] - 15:4, 15:5,	328 [3] - 20:5, 20:7,	able [6] - 14:17, 25:7,	2:15	
17:15, 17:23	21:8	26:14, 34:24, 35:9,	ALFANO [1] - 2:18	background [1] -
100 [1] - 35:8	3333 [1] - 2:22	36:17	ALL [1] - 4:1	14:21
103[1] - 1:11	33950 [1] - 2:6	above-entitled [1] - 38:17	allegations [4] -	backtrack [1] - 10:12
10th [2] - 17:8, 25:18 110 [1] - 35:12	38th [1] - 2:19	absolutely [2] - 20:3,	30:21, 31:1, 31:8,	BARNES [1] - 3:2
110 [1] - 35.12 12 [3] - 29:12, 29:17,	4	26:19	32:2	barring [1] - 37:12 base [2] - 6:22, 36:7
30:1	4	accommodate[1] -	alleged [1] - 36:19 allow [1] - 34:15	base [2] - 6.22, 36.7 based [3] - 16:10,
120 [9] - 28:19, 28:20,	40 [7] - 28:8, 28:21,	27:1	allow[1] - 34.15 allowable[1] - 35:23	24:21, 31:18
28:25, 30:5, 33:24,	34:6, 34:8, 34:10,	accompli _[1] - 21:5	almost _[2] - 22:19,	basis [1] - 32:8
34:1, 34:13, 34:23,	34:14, 35:22	according [1] - 26:11	24:25	Bates [1] - 26:4
35:8	41-page [1] - 21:10	account[1] - 23:10	alone [2] - 20:10, 32:8	Baylen [1] - 1:14
13 [3] - 1:6, 4:1, 4:3	44 [1] - 14:3	acknowledging [1] -	aloud [1] - 29:13	Beach [1] - 2:9
15 [6] - 6:11, 23:22,	45 [2] - 24:9, 34:6	32:9	ALSO [1] - 3:9	bear [2] - 27:15, 27:16
25:19, 25:20, 25:23,	45-page [1] - 14:3	Act [1] - 31:2	amend [3] - 10:17,	began [1] - 19:23
38:21	45202 [1] - 3:7	Action (1) 1:3	12:16, 21:17	behalf [7] - 5:7, 9:17,
15219 [1] - 2:19	483s [1] - 20:17	ACTION [1] - 1:3 acts [1] - 13:20	AmerisourceBergen	12:15, 27:21, 27:24,
15th [2] - 6:7, 23:3 1638 [1] - 2:9	4:00 [1] - 1:7 4:01 [1] - 4:1	Adam [4] - 4:14, 8:9,	[2] - 3:7, 5:8	35:10, 37:2 BEHRAM [1] - 2:8
16th [1] - 37:11	7.01 [i] - 7.1	14:6, 15:16	amount [1] - 35:23	Behram [4] - 4:21, 7:8,
17 [1] - 25:20	5	ADAM[1] - 1:11	Angeles [1] - 3:3 answer [3] - 16:5,	7:25, 8:4
17th [4] - 2:16, 24:6,		add [4] - 12:13, 33:20,	20:3, 24:6	believes [1] - 12:7
24:7, 25:18	50 [3] - 34:8, 35:11,	33:25, 37:21	anticipate [3] - 17:25,	below [1] - 17:11
1835 [1] - 1:17	36:2	additional [1] - 9:21	22:20, 35:1	benefit [1] - 4:8
19-2875 [1] - 4:3	55 [2] - 20:6, 20:7	address [4] - 9:4, 9:5,	apologize [1] - 19:8	BERNE [1] - 3:5
19103 [2] - 1:18, 2:16	55402 [1] - 2:13	19:24, 28:2	appearance[1] - 4:8	better[1] - 34:4
1:19-md-02875-RBK-	56 [1] - 20:6 57 [2] - 20:6, 21:7	adjourned [1] - 38:12	appearances [1] - 4:6	between [1] - 12:3
JS [1] - 1:4	5 7 [2] - 20:6, 21:7 5:07 [1] - 38:13	administratively [1] - 7:13	appendix [1] - 15:4	bit [5] - 5:21, 6:1,
1st [1] - 6:12	0.01 [1] 00.10	adopted [2] - 12:20,	applied [1] - 23:7	14:21, 21:3, 33:12
2	6	12:23	applying [1] - 22:13	blessed [1] - 15:3 board [1] - 19:19
		advance [1] - 36:20	appreciate [3] - 5:17, 8:19, 18:3	bodily [1] - 29:19
2019 _[2] - 15:5, 17:8	60 [1] - 28:20	affects [1] - 24:1	appreciated [1] - 38:6	BOSICK [1] - 2:18
2020 [7] - 1:6, 4:1, 4:3,	600 [2] - 1:14, 3:6	afternoon [7] - 4:15,	approved [3] - 15:3,	bottom [1] - 10:24
6:7, 6:11, 6:14,		4:16, 4:18, 4:25, 5:4,	15:7, 37:11	box [1] - 7:10
38:21	7	5:6, 12:10	April [1] - 22:17	breach [1] - 32:22
2029 [1] - 3:3	701 [1] - 2:3	afterwards [1] - 15:24	argue [1] - 37:13	BRIAN [1] - 2:21
20th [1] - 37:6	70130 [1] - 2:3	agenda [9] - 5:20,	ARGUMENT [1] - 1:5	Brian [1] - 5:10
2150 [1] - 2:12 22nd [1] - 37:12	756-0160 [1] - 1:20	7:20, 12:2, 21:11, 36:12, 37:4, 37:9,	argument [2] - 12:5,	brief [22] - 22:23, 28:1,
23 [3] - 20:4, 20:19,		36.12, 37.4, 37.9, 37:15, 37:21	14:20	28:3, 28:4, 28:7,
21:22	8	ago [2] - 10:1, 18:4	arguments [4] - 14:25,	28:8, 28:13, 29:11, 30:21, 31:4, 31:6,
23rd [1] - 37:6		agree [2] - 7:22, 9:11	34:16, 35:10, 35:19 assert[1] - 31:25	31:13, 31:15, 32:21,
2500 [1] - 2:22	8 [2] - 15:5, 17:9	agreeable [1] - 27:13	assertive[1] - 31.23	33:1, 35:4, 35:25,
27th [6] - 24:6, 24:9,	80 [13] - 28:6, 28:7,	agreed [15] - 14:24,	assumption [1] - 27:2	36:4, 37:12
25:14, 26:18, 27:10,	28:15, 28:23, 29:1, 29:21, 33:19, 33:20,	15:12, 15:14, 17:10,	Atlanta [1] - 2:22	briefing [8] - 6:17,
36:14	33:21, 35:8, 35:15	17:18, 17:22, 19:11,	attached [3] - 17:10,	16:25, 27:11, 34:1,
2800 [1] - 3:6	80-page [1] - 35:4	21:13, 21:16, 22:7,	18:7, 21:11	34:7, 37:10, 37:11,
2900 [1] - 1:17	800 [1] - 2:12	22:14, 23:9, 24:24,	attaching [1] - 14:24	38:8
	, -			

briefs [10] - 23:23, 28:12, 28:16, 28:20, 30:20, 33:20, 33:25, 35:16, 35:22, 36:4 bring [3] - 26:14, 30:1 broad [1] - 25:9 brought [3] - 7:1, 20:25, 29:13 **Brown** [1] - 7:9 **BrownGreer** [1] - 7:2 bulk[1] - 31:7 **bumped** [1] - 30:5 burdensomeness [1] - 13:11 BY[12] - 1:11, 1:14, 1:17, 2:2, 2:5, 2:8, 2:11, 2:15, 2:18, 2:21, 3:2, 3:5

C

CA [1] - 3:3 California [1] - 2:9 Camp [1] - 2:3 candidly [1] - 29:9 captured [1] - 13:2 case [12] - 5:21, 5:22, 6:1, 7:6, 7:11, 9:9, 14:16, 21:6, 25:22, 32:12, 33:4, 33:8 cases [7] - 7:3, 7:4, 7:5, 7:12, 7:17, 36:21, 38:1 cast [1] - 23:3 categories [2] - 19:4, 23:5 caught[1] - 27:13 caused [1] - 8:17 Centre [1] - 2:19 Century [1] - 3:3 certain [3] - 10:2, 17:18, 17:19 certainly [5] - 11:11, 12:14, 13:21, 23:5, 30:9 certify [1] - 38:16 cetera [2] - 16:15, 17:17 chain [8] - 27:25, 28:3, 31:8, 31:17, 32:6, 32:10, 34:14, 35:23 chance [2] - 21:10, 22:16 change [1] - 25:14 changed [3] - 13:8, 16:9, 25:17 changing [2] - 23:22, 25:20 check [1] - 7:10 cincinnati [1] - 3:7

circumstances [1] conference [10] - 4:4, 37:13 CIVIL [1] - 1:3 claim [2] - 31:21, 32:23 claims [8] - 29:24, 29:25, 30:22, 31:1, 31:22, 32:1, 33:6, 34:17 class [2] - 29:18, 29:23 Clem [3] - 4:25, 12:11, 19:22 **CLEM**[1] - 2:18 Clerk[1] - 3:10 client [2] - 24:2, 24:9 close [1] - 17:14 co[1] - 11:15 Co[1] - 3:4 co-counsel [1] - 11:15 Coast[1] - 2:9 colleagues [1] - 12:13 collect [1] - 22:13 collected [1] - 13:5 collecting [4] - 7:24, 8:21, 8:23, 18:25 collective [1] - 13:3 comfortable [1] -15:20 coming [3] - 8:22, 25:5, 38:2 **Commencing** [1] - 1:7 common [5] - 28:2, 31:7, 31:10, 36:1 communicated [1] -27:12 complaint [5] - 30:13, 30:18, 32:16, 33:6, 36:25 complaints [12] -27:18, 29:11, 29:22, 29:23, 30:2, 30:11, 31:25, 32:23, 32:25, 33:13, 37:3, 37:6 complete [4] - 6:13. 10:16, 11:5, 19:10 completely [2] -16:21, 21:8 completion [1] - 11:23 comprise [1] - 29:24 computer [1] - 1:22 computer-aided [1] -1.22 concern [1] - 35:1 concession [1] -16:23 conditions [1] - 17:16 conducting [1] - 24:22

confer [4] - 13:13,

21:18, 33:17, 36:17

4:10, 6:19, 6:21, 6:23, 10:25, 26:24, 27:10, 36:20 conferral [1] - 30:5 conferring [1] - 29:8 confine [1] - 29:20 **confirm** [1] - 6:3 confirmation [1] -38.9 **confirming** [1] - 38:8 confused [1] - 34:18 confusion [2] - 29:5, 29:14 CONLEE [1] - 2:2 Conlee [2] - 4:19, 37:20 connecters [1] - 23:6 consider [2] - 13:7, 35:3 constantly [1] - 21:2 consumer [1] - 29:24 contacted [2] - 16:1, 16:2 contemplate [1] -16:17 contemplated [8] -16:6. 18:5. 18:16. 19:7, 20:2, 20:14, 20:24, 21:21 contemplating [1] -16:16 contention [2] - 13:10, 14:5 contest [1] - 14:2 contesting [1] - 17:23 context [1] - 33:4 **CONTINUED** [2] - 2:1, contrary [1] - 27:3 control [1] - 7:2 conventional [1] -29:12 convert [1] - 6:23 core [8] - 9:10, 9:20, 9:21, 10:2, 10:9, 10:16, 11:5, 11:24 corona [1] - 23:15 coronavirus [3] -22:15, 24:23, 25:1 correct[4] - 33:7, 33:22, 38:16 correctly [1] - 7:14 counsel [15] - 5:16, 8:16, 10:7, 10:14, 11:10, 11:15, 11:18, 11:21, 18:23, 25:21, 27:12, 27:16, 29:2, 36:10 counterproposal [5] -

12:18, 12:23, 20:1, 22:4, 22:6 counterproposals [1] - 20:13 counts [1] - 21:15 couple [4] - 5:19, 12:4, 16:1, 37:25 course [4] - 4:11, 6:16, 12:4, 32:1 Court [2] - 1:19, 38:19 court[1] - 15:7 **COURT**[1] - 1:1 Court's [11] - 6:4, 11:18, 12:11, 12:12, 13:21, 14:23, 20:2, 23:17, 25:13, 32:3, 32:8 court-approved[1] -15:7 covered [1] - 22:6 covering [1] - 31:9 crack[1] - 12:12 crisis [6] - 5:22, 6:2, 9:8, 23:10, 23:15 cross [2] - 17:3, 33:15 CRR [1] - 38:19 current[3] - 8:8, 23:1, 37:3 custodians [5] - 10:4, 10:6, 10:13, 20:21, 22:19 cuts [1] - 29:18 CVS[1] - 3:4 D

DANIEL [2] - 1:14, 3:5 data [6] - 12:24, 13:4, 14:2, 14:4, 20:20 date [4] - 6:13, 7:16, 11:23, 25:20 dates [1] - 27:12 Datett [1] - 38:21 days [3] - 24:7, 24:9, 37:25 de [1] - 16:14 de-duplication [1] -16:14 deadline [7] - 9:10, 10:15, 23:1, 23:3, 23:5, 23:22, 37:5 deadlines [7] - 6:15, 22:25, 23:9, 23:12, 23:14, 23:18 deal [3] - 6:17, 19:15, 33:6 dealing [9] - 5:23, 5:24, 6:16, 25:15, 28:3, 28:4, 32:3, 33:6, 33:12

deals [1] - 31:20 December [11] -14:23, 15:4, 17:8, 17:15, 17:23, 20:4, 20:19, 21:4, 21:22, 22:8, 22:15 decide [13] - 23:21, 23:23, 24:3, 24:5, 24:6, 24:8, 25:18, 25:19, 31:11, 32:24, 33:9 decided [1] - 37:14 deciding [1] - 24:4 decision [1] - 14:13 defendant [9] - 16:2, 24:12, 25:16, 26:6, 26:9, 28:1, 29:15, 32:21, 36:4 Defendant [4] - 2:17, 2:20, 3:4, 3:7 defendants [38] -4:22, 5:5, 5:8, 5:11, 6:7, 9:9, 12:15, 12:21, 12:24, 13:5, 13:18, 13:23, 15:13, 17:21, 18:24, 21:9, 21:15, 21:20, 23:1, 23:10, 24:19, 25:8, 25:14, 25:23, 26:3, 29:20, 29:25, 30:21, 30:23, 31:9, 32:5, 34:17, 34:23, 35:11, 35:15, 36:19, 37:2, 37:17 **Defendants** [1] - 2:23

defendants' [6] - 5:1, 6:10, 26:2, 26:10, 31:6, 33:23 Defense [2] - 2:17, 2:20 defense [6] - 4:24, 15:19, 16:6, 16:17, 26:23, 27:1 defenses [1] - 31:18 defer[1] - 18:16 deficiencies [2] -36:13, 36:20 deficient [1] - 37:7 delay [4] - 9:6, 23:4, 23:14, 23:17 delayed [1] - 5:21 delaying [1] - 24:4 delays [1] - 8:17 demonstrated [1] -20:25 depositions [2] - 8:10, 8:12 described [1] - 17:11 designed [1] - 19:20

detailed [1] - 17:10

1:14, 1:17, 2:2, 2:5,

determine [1] - 34:24 developing [1] - 15:19 developments [1] -6:24 devised [1] - 17:10 different [12] - 18:8, 24:18, 31:17, 31:18, 32:4, 32:5, 32:9, 32:10, 35:10, 35:18 digested [1] - 30:8 directed [4] - 27:18, 29:3, 30:18, 32:15 directions [1] - 11:18 directive [1] - 29:20 discovery [15] - 4:4, 9:12, 9:13, 9:20, 9:22, 10:3, 10:9, 10:16, 10:18, 11:6, 11:24, 11:25, 14:15, 26:21 discreet[3] - 8:6, 16:1, 19:2 discrete [1] - 19:14 discuss [4] - 5:17, 6:16, 30:21, 37:16 discussing [1] - 8:2 discussion [4] - 12:6, 12:9, 15:7, 19:23 discussions [5] -9:18, 9:24, 10:10, 10:12, 20:16 dismiss [9] - 7:10, 30:14, 30:15, 30:18, 31:20, 32:4, 32:17, 32:19, 32:22 dismissed [3] - 7:5, 7:6, 7:11 dismissing [1] - 7:9 dispute [8] - 12:3, 15:11, 17:18, 22:25, 23:6, 23:16, 26:3, 37:3 disputed [1] - 17:11 disputes [3] - 9:4, 9:5, 26:15 **DISTRICT**[2] - 1:1, 1:1 divided [2] - 30:7, 32:14 Docket [5] - 4:3, 15:5, 20:5, 20:7, 21:7 document [4] - 15:17, 16:21, 26:4, 26:20 documents [23] - 6:8, 6:10, 8:7, 8:13, 9:11, 10:12, 10:23, 13:1, 13:15, 14:9, 14:10, 14:11, 15:9, 16:23, 17:13, 18:14, 18:25,

20:20, 23:2, 23:7,

25:22 done [10] - 6:8, 6:12, 13:17, 15:18, 15:23, 16:12, 21:19, 21:21, 26:22, 29:15 down [1] - 16:21 downstream [1] - 37:9 dozens [1] - 25:5 drabs [1] - 16:7 dribs [1] - 16:7 **Drug** [1] - 31:2 drug [1] - 18:10 Duane [1] - 37:2 **DUANE** [1] - 2:14 due [2] - 22:15, 24:23 duplication [1] - 16:14 duplicative [1] - 33:2 during [1] - 4:9 duties [5] - 31:18, 31:19, 31:21, 32:4, 32:10

Ε

e-mail [2] - 16:14, 27:15 earliest [1] - 23:21 easier [2] - 33:9, 33:12 East [1] - 3:3 economic [8] - 17:16, 29:18, 29:23, 29:24, 30:13, 30:18, 31:22, 32:17 edits [1] - 26:12 effect [1] - 10:21 efficient [1] - 32:6 **EIR** [1] - 11:20 Eisenhower [1] - 1:11 either [4] - 19:7, 24:5, 24:11, 26:14 **encountered** [1] - 8:5 end [8] - 6:19, 8:22, 10:25, 11:22, 26:15, 37:7, 37:13, 38:10 endorsed [1] - 25:12 enter [2] - 4:8, 38:8 entered [1] - 21:4 entire [3] - 19:11, 32:9, 35:14 entities [5] - 8:21, 10:6, 10:18, 11:3, 17:17 entitled [2] - 34:10, 38:17 entries [1] - 4:6 envision [2] - 30:12, 30:13 **ESI** [5] - 6:16, 12:3, 14:15, 14:22, 26:20 **ESQUIRE** [12] - 1:11,

2:8, 2:11, 2:15, 2:15, 2:18, 2:21, 3:2 essentially [2] - 19:17, 19:25 established [2] -15:25. 17:1 establishment 131 -10:3, 10:8, 20:17 et [2] - 16:15, 17:17 evaluate [2] - 13:10, 27.7 evaluating [2] - 17:11, 32.4 event[1] - 23:17 evidence[1] - 13:23 exactly [4] - 19:13, 25:23, 26:7, 32:8 example [6] - 16:14, 25:3, 29:16, 29:23, 32:13, 34:25 examples [1] - 13:13 except[1] - 23:14 **exceptions** [1] - 12:22 excuse [2] - 13:16, 17:24 **executive** [1] - 5:2 Exhibit [2] - 14:24, 15:4 exhibit [2] - 15:7,

F

21:10

36:19

38:3

existing [1] - 10:17

expect [2] - 29:16,

expects [1] - 10:2

expert[1] - 14:15

extend [1] - 37:5

extent [2] - 31:10,

express [1] - 32:22

extension [1] - 37:11

face[1] - 16:11 fact [5] - 26:2, 26:6, 26:10, 36:12 factual [3] - 30:21, 31:1, 32:1 8:16 fair [3] - 13:3, 13:22, 19:24 fait [1] - 21:4 false [3] - 21:3, 22:20, 22:21 fantastic [1] - 7:15 far [2] - 8:5, 16:25 **FARR**[1] - 2:5 1:20 FDA [1] - 25:4 front [3] - 15:17, 17:6, February [2] - 22:3, 17:9 22:16 fruit [1] - 22:2

18:23, 19:8 few [5] - 8:6, 8:22, 15:1, 18:8, 18:9 figure [2] - 19:15, 38:3 file 151 - 25:14, 29:17. 30:17, 30:25, 34:4 filed [1] - 30:20 filing [1] - 37:25 finalize [1] - 26:17 fine [3] - 24:11, 24:13, 35:13 firm [1] - 7:10 FIRM [1] - 2:5 firms [1] - 7:11 first [8] - 4:10, 10:1, 12:2, 20:25, 24:8, 24:9, 32:15, 34:1 fit [1] - 28:12 five [1] - 19:14 fixing [1] - 37:5 flexible [1] - 35:8 **Floor** [1] - 2:19 floor[1] - 14:20 Florida [2] - 1:15, 2:6 focus [2] - 31:12, 31:14 focused [1] - 31:4 follow [2] - 21:21, 22:14 followed [2] - 15:15, 19:3 following [2] - 20:9, 22:4 FOR [1] - 1:1 foregoing [1] - 38:16 foreign [1] - 9:9 foreseeable [1] - 6:5 foreshadow[1] -16:18 Form [1] - 20:17 form [3] - 36:25, 37:3, 37:5 formal [1] - 23:20 formalized [1] - 20:1 formula [1] - 10:19 forth [1] - 17:22 forward [3] - 6:4, 6:24, frankly [1] - 22:2 FREEMAN [1] - 1:10 Friday [1] - 27:6 Friedlander [2] - 1:19, friedlanderreporter @gmail.com [1] -

Ferretti [4] - 7:25, 8:6,

fruitful [1] - 10:9 fully [3] - 22:14, 22:17, 22:19 fulsome [2] - 24:8, 24:9 future [1] - 6:5

G generic [1] - 25:15 **Geoppinger** [1] - 5:7 GEOPPINGER [3] -3:5, 5:6, 5:7 GEORGE [1] - 2:5 George [1] - 4:17 Georgia [1] - 2:22 given [6] - 14:7, 14:8, 22:18, 24:24, 33:23 globally [1] - 13:24 Goldberg [14] - 4:24, 11:9, 22:9, 24:15, 29:9, 30:3, 30:12, 33:5, 33:14, 33:16, 34:3, 34:20, 34:21, 35:4 GOLDBERG [25] -2:15, 4:23, 7:22, 8:19, 11:9, 22:9, 22:12, 24:17, 26:5, 26:8, 27:5, 27:19, 27:23, 27:25, 28:11, 28:15, 28:18, 28:24, 30:19, 33:14, 33:22, 34:7, 34:12, 35:7, 37:17 GOLDENBERG [4] -2:11, 2:11, 4:20, 36:15 Goldenberg [2] - 4:20. 36:16 **GOLOMB**[1] - 1:16 Gorda [1] - 2:6 **GORDON**[1] - 2:18 gotta [1] - 28:8 Grant [1] - 11:14 grant[1] - 28:10 great [4] - 5:3, 26:17, 28:23 GREENBERG [1] -2:21 Greenberg [1] - 5:11 Grier[1] - 7:9 gross [3] - 14:9, 14:10 **Group** [2] - 2:17, 2:20 group [4] - 4:24, 12:23, 27:24, 32:13 groups [2] - 30:17, 33:7

guess [1] - 27:2

Н

hand [1] - 18:1 handled [2] - 20:18, 22.1 handling [1] - 33:8 hands [2] - 23:19, 26:25 hanging [1] - 22:2 hard [2] - 29:1, 35:18 head [1] - 19:25 headed [1] - 13:19 Health [1] - 3:4 hear [6] - 4:11, 9:15, 12:5, 18:20, 19:21, heard [3] - 4:11, 4:12, 17:5 heavy [1] - 16:19 hello [2] - 4:14, 14:6 Hetero [9] - 9:9, 9:18, 9:22, 9:24, 10:1, 10:6, 10:11, 11:10, 11:15 hi [1] - 34:21 highlighted [2] -21:12, 21:16 Highway [1] - 2:9 **hit** [3] - 6:2, 9:8, 21:15 hits [1] - 14:9 hold [1] - 17:4 holding [1] - 4:4 Honik [3] - 4:15, 29:7, HONIK [5] - 1:16, 1:17, 4:15, 29:7, 32:20 Honor [51] - 4:14, 4:15, 4:16, 4:18, 4:23, 4:25, 5:4, 5:6, 7:8, 7:14, 8:4, 8:19, 9:15. 11:8. 11:9. 11:14, 11:19, 12:1, 12:10, 13:12, 14:6, 14:14, 14:18, 15:16, 15:23, 15:24, 16:4, 18:3, 18:19, 18:22, 19:22, 19:25, 20:4, 20:14, 21:9, 21:13, 22:9, 23:25, 25:25, 26:5, 26:15, 26:19, 27:5, 27:19, 28:11, 29:7, 36:15, 37:1, 37:17, 37:19, 37:20 **HONORABLE** [1] - 1:8 hope [1] - 6:1 hopeful [1] - 10:10 hopefully [6] - 5:25,

7:20, 8:17, 8:22,

26:14, 37:13

HUDSON [3] - 9:15, 9:17, 11:8 Hudson [1] - 9:17 hundred [4] - 15:6, 28:13, 28:25, 30:4

1

identified [2] - 19:4,

19:14 identify [4] - 6:9, 8:23, 8:25, 10:4 imminent [1] - 16:22 imposed [1] - 23:1 improved [1] - 13:15 IN [1] - 1:3 in-person [1] - 6:21 **inadequate**[1] - 16:11 Inc [2] - 2:23, 2:24 include [2] - 10:25, 11:20 included [1] - 10:11 including [3] - 11:24, 12:25, 19:18 incorporated [1] -15:6 incredibly [1] - 16:10 independently [1] -32:4 India [1] - 11:15 Indian [1] - 10:6 indicate [1] - 6:6 indicated [3] - 6:20, 22:24, 23:13 indicating [1] - 26:21 indulge [2] - 5:18, 37:22 Industries [1] - 2:23 inform [1] - 37:4 **information** [9] - 7:3, 7:24, 8:21, 12:15, 12:17, 13:9, 16:7, 22:13, 24:22 informed [2] - 7:6. 10:7 initial [1] - 12:12 injury [3] - 29:19, 31:21, 32:16 innocent[1] - 31:3 inspection [3] - 10:3, 10:8, 20:17 inspector [1] - 25:4 instance [1] - 12:25 instead [1] - 8:18 intend [4] - 8:25, 22:14, 22:17, 27:1 intended [1] - 24:20 intending [1] - 17:24 intention [2] - 27:20 interests [1] - 7:16

investigation [1] -14:21 invite [1] - 12:14 involved [2] - 18:18, 38:3 issue [20] - 7:1, 7:21, 8:1, 8:15, 9:7, 9:8, 12:2, 14:20, 17:24, 18:15, 22:24, 23:21, 25:18, 25:20, 26:2, 27:11, 30:1, 36:12, 37:4, 37:9 issued [1] - 26:8 issues [41] - 5:17, 5:19, 7:19, 8:2, 8:5, 8:6, 8:17, 8:23, 9:14, 9:19, 16:1, 17:19, 18:11, 19:1, 19:2, 19:14, 21:24, 21:25, 25:8, 25:15, 28:2, 28:4, 28:5, 29:19, 30:6, 30:7, 31:4, 31:7, 31:9, 31:10, 31:13, 31:14, 33:10, 33:11, 33:24, 36:1, 36:18, 36:23, 37:16

interrupt [1] - 34:19

J

itself [1] - 20:9

Jaffe [1] - 14:16 January [6] - 7:23, 18:4, 19:13, 21:25, 22:16 **Jeff** [1] - 5:7 **JEFFREY** [1] - 3:5 JERSEY [1] - 1:1 Jersey [1] - 1:12 Joe [1] - 7:24 JOEL [1] - 1:8 **Johnston** [1] - 5:5 JOHNSTON [2] - 3:2, 5:4 joined [1] - 25:8 **joining** [1] - 13:5 joint [1] - 4:23 Joint [2] - 2:17, 2:20 **JUDGE**[1] - 1:8 Judge [22] - 5:13, 6:20, 12:20, 21:2, 22:2, 24:11, 27:12, 27:13, 28:9, 29:3, 29:4, 29:5, 29:21, 33:9, 33:14, 33:17, 33:19, 34:19, 35:1, 35:6, 35:20, 36:8 July [5] - 6:11, 23:3, 23:22, 25:20, 25:23 June [10] - 23:21,

24:6, 24:7, 25:18, 25:19, 25:20, 37:11, 37:12, 37:13

K

KANNER [1] - 2:2 Karen [3] - 1:19, 5:13, 38:19 KATZ[1] - 1:10 keep[1] - 25:21 keeping [1] - 7:2 kept[1] - 7:16 key [2] - 10:4, 10:5 kinds [1] - 34:23 **KIRTLAND**[1] - 2:8 knows [1] - 15:24 Kugler [13] - 6:20, 27:12, 27:13, 28:9, 29:3, 29:6, 29:21, 33:9, 33:17, 33:19, 35:6, 35:20, 36:8 Kugler's [1] - 35:1

L

laid [3] - 14:12, 15:25,

Labs [1] - 11:15

large [3] - 31:22,

31:23, 31:24

Lasalle [1] - 2:12

16:9

last[7] - 7:1, 8:22, 9:7, 14:8, 26:13, 27:6, 37:9 lastly [1] - 21:2 late [1] - 16:25 Lauren [1] - 9:17 Law [1] - 3:10 LAW [2] - 2:5, 2:11 lead [3] - 12:6, 12:14, 14:15 leadership [2] - 7:13, least [4] - 6:12, 9:24, 19:9, 33:8 leave [1] - 34:6 left [1] - 9:14 less [1] - 24:7 letter [19] - 5:18, 14:3, 14:8, 14:12, 15:5, 15:8, 15:25, 16:4, 16:10, 17:6, 17:8, 17:23, 18:7, 18:16, 23:23, 26:21, 26:23, 27:5, 27:7 letters [2] - 5:16, 12:4 level [4] - 32:5, 32:7, 34:13, 35:22 levels [3] - 28:3,

31:17, 32:10 **LEVIN**[1] - 1:13 **LIABILITY** [1] - 1:4 liberal [2] - 23:11 light [2] - 16:24, 17:1 limit [3] - 35:3, 35:14, 36:3 limited [3] - 13:15, 13:16, 31:1 line [3] - 4:13, 11:11, 11:16 links [1] - 12:17 list [4] - 20:10, 24:21, 36:19, 36:21 listed [1] - 5:17 listening [1] - 29:5 **LITIGATION** [1] - 1:4 litigation [1] - 32:9 live [3] - 35:17, 35:20, 35:21 LLC[3] - 1:10, 2:2, 2:23 LLP [6] - 2:8, 2:14, 2:18, 2:21, 3:2, 3:5 local [1] - 34:5 look [6] - 6:4, 14:22, 31:5, 31:13, 31:14, 32:7 looking [3] - 7:18, 11:21, 27:15 Loretta [7] - 3:10, 5:14, 5:15, 7:1, 29:4, 34:21, 36:7 Los [1] - 3:3 loss [1] - 31:22 Louisiana [1] - 2:3 low[1] - 22:2 Ltd [1] - 2:23 luckily [1] - 34:4

М

MAGISTRATE [1] -1:8 mail [2] - 16:14, 27:15 management[1] -20:21 Mandarin [2] - 7:21, 7:23 manner [1] - 22:7 manufacturer [9] -26:6, 26:9, 28:1, 30:20, 30:22, 31:6, 31:9, 35:24, 36:4 manufacturers [3] -29:17, 35:5, 35:12 manufacturers' [2] -34:25, 35:3 manufacturing [4] -12:21, 17:16, 32:21,

One [1] - 2:19

34:7, 37:21

open [1] - 14:19

option [1] - 24:1

Orleans [1] - 2:3

outer [1] - 36:3

ORAL [1] - 1:5

33:10 March [7] - 12:19, 16:3, 19:12, 20:2, 22:4, 22:16, 37:6 Market [1] - 1:17 Marlene [2] - 4:20, 36:15 MARLENE [1] - 2:11 master [3] - 29:11, 30:11, 31:25 material [1] - 9:23 materially [1] - 16:9 matter [4] - 4:2, 5:25, 32:13, 38:17 matters [1] - 29:9 MAZIE [1] - 1:10 MDL [1] - 4:3 mean [4] - 19:9, 24:5, 28:13, 34:7 meaningful [1] - 19:24 mechanical [1] - 1:21 medical [4] - 17:16, 29:18, 31:23, 32:17 meet [3] - 13:13, 21:17, 36:16 meeting [1] - 29:8 mentioned [3] - 8:20, 20:4. 21:9 message[1] - 11:12 method [2] - 17:11, 24:24 methodology [1] -16:11 middle [1] - 23:21 midst [3] - 8:20, 22:13, 25:6 might [12] - 6:21, 14:7, 19:5, 28:20, 28:21, 32:12, 32:14, 32:18, 33:12, 35:1, 35:2 million [1] - 16:16 mind [1] - 25:21 **Minneapolis** [1] - 2:13 Minnesota [1] - 2:13 miscellaneous [3] -5:19, 7:19, 9:7 modifiers [1] - 19:19 modify [1] - 13:24 moment[1] - 18:4 momentum [1] - 6:2 Monday [1] - 27:6 monitoring [3] -29:18, 31:24, 32:17 month [6] - 6:20, 10:25, 11:22, 26:15, 37:7, 38:10 mood[1] - 28:10 Morris [1] - 37:2 MORRIS [1] - 2:14 most [7] - 12:22,

16:12, 28:9, 30:4, 30:8, 32:6, 36:18 mostly [2] - 13:4, 22:1 motion [17] - 13:18. 13:20, 13:22, 16:19, 23:20, 25:14, 29:18, 29:22. 30:1. 30:17. 30:25, 31:20, 32:3, 32:14, 32:22, 34:22, 38:1 motions [9] - 27:17, 27:20, 29:12, 30:14, 31:5, 32:18, 33:20, 34:5 move[1] - 16:21 **MR** [54] - 4:14, 4:15, 4:16, 4:21, 4:23, 4:25, 5:6, 5:10, 7:8, 7:22, 8:4, 8:9, 8:14, 8:19, 11:9, 11:14, 11:19, 12:1, 12:10, 13:12, 14:6, 15:16, 18:1, 18:19, 18:22, 19:22, 22:9, 22:12, 23:25, 24:11, 24:17, 25:25, 26:5, 26:8, 26:19, 26:23, 27:5, 27:19, 27:23, 27:25, 28:11, 28:15, 28:18, 28:24, 29:7, 30:19, 32:20, 33:14, 33:22, 34:7, 34:12, 35:7, 37:17, 37:18 MS [14] - 4:18, 4:20, 5:4, 5:13, 9:15, 9:17, 11:8, 29:4, 34:19, 36:6, 36:9, 36:15, 37:20, 37:24 MTD[3] - 34:25, 35:3, 35:4 Mylan [13] - 2:20, 5:1, 12:5, 12:9, 12:17,

N

13:5, 13:8, 13:17,

14:1, 14:4, 15:25,

Mylan's [1] - 22:18

Nakul [1] - 11:15 name [2] - 4:10, 25:4 named [1] - 25:4 names [1] - 18:10 narrative[1] - 21:3 NE[1] - 2:22 necessary [1] - 16:12 need [16] - 5:13, 10:14, 10:23, 12:7, 13:2, 13:10, 16:13, 20:25, 21:17, 22:21,

25:9, 25:10, 26:10, 34:6, 35:9, 35:19 needed [4] - 10:7, 16:13, 20:11, 20:23 needs [1] - 35:25 neglected [1] - 38:5 negotiated [2] - 15:22, 18:23 negotiations [1] - 10:5 Nesbit [1] - 2:6 never [6] - 16:6, 16:16, 18:10, 19:7, 19:9, 21:6 NEW [1] - 1:1 new [3] - 9:8, 15:13, 17:24 New [2] - 1:12, 2:3 next [9] - 6:24, 10:24, 20:15, 26:1, 27:11, 36:12, 36:20, 37:11, 37:25 NIGH [1] - 1:14 night [1] - 26:13 noncustodial [1] -17:13 note [4] - 7:7, 10:24, 14:1, 26:1 noted [1] - 6:15 notes [3] - 6:6, 7:18, 38:6 nothing [2] - 37:17, 37:18 notion [1] - 25:8 November [2] - 6:13, 6:14 number [10] - 20:7, 20:12, 30:7, 33:23, 34:15, 34:22, 34:24, 35:9, 38:7 **NUMBER**[1] - 1:3 numbers [5] - 14:8, 14:9, 14:10, 26:4

0

objected [1] - 21:8 objection [1] - 21:23 objections [4] - 15:1, 21:12, 23:12, 27:10 obligations [5] -31:18, 31:19, 31:21, 32:5, 32:11 obviously [2] - 6:21, 23:10 October [1] - 6:13 **OF**[1] - 1:1 office [2] - 7:25, 22:1 Official [1] - 1:19 often [1] - 15:23 **OH**[1] - 3:7

- 14:5 overly [1] - 25:9 Oxford [1] - 2:19 Ρ **p.m** [3] - 1:7, 4:1, 38:13 Pacific [1] - 2:9 **PACKARD**[1] - 2:8 Page [3] - 17:9, 20:7, 21:7 page [2] - 6:6, 20:15 Pages [2] - 15:5, 20:6 pages [38] - 27:14, 28:6, 28:7, 28:8, 28:9, 28:12, 28:15, 28:19, 28:20, 29:21, 30:4, 30:5, 30:7, 33:16, 33:19, 33:20, 33:21, 33:24, 34:1, 34:6, 34:8, 34:9,

omnibus [4] - 29:17, 34:13, 34:14, 34:15, 29:22, 29:25, 34:22 34:22, 34:23, 34:24, 35:9, 35:11, 35:15, one [27] - 7:4, 9:7, 35:22, 36:5, 36:11, 10:15, 18:10, 20:7, 38.8 22:10, 25:3, 25:14, PAPANTONIO [1] -27:16. 27:17. 27:18. 1:13 27:20, 27:24, 28:13, paper [1] - 8:7 28:14, 28:20, 29:8, parameters [1] - 26:9 29:11, 30:20, 32:24, PAREKH [6] - 2:8, 33:10, 33:11, 33:21, 4:21, 7:8, 8:4, 18:19, 18:22 ongoing [1] - 12:9 Parekh [8] - 4:21, 7:8, 8:4, 8:24, 14:14, opening [1] - 28:7 18:2, 18:16, 24:20 opportunity [7] - 9:23, Park[1] - 3:3 17:5, 22:22, 24:20, Parkway [1] - 1:11 24:24, 25:10, 34:16 part [4] - 10:9, 12:22, 31:22, 31:23 parties [18] - 6:3, 7:20, order [24] - 10:4, 10:5, 9:13, 12:4, 12:8, 10:9, 10:17, 11:1, 13:9, 15:12, 15:14, 11:24, 14:23, 20:2, 17:9, 17:19, 20:16, 20:4, 20:6, 20:9, 21:17, 22:7, 25:11, 20:14, 20:16, 20:19, 27:13, 30:8, 31:16, 21:4, 21:22, 22:5, 34:8 24:14, 25:13, 26:8, **PARTIES** [1] - 4:1 26:11, 36:22, 38:8 party [4] - 19:7, 34:5, ordered [1] - 21:14 34:8, 34:9 original [1] - 12:22 party's [1] - 15:11 PC[1] - 1:16 Pennsacola [1] - 1:15 outlined [1] - 20:6 Pennsylvania [3] outlines [1] - 12:25 1:18, 2:16, 2:19 outside [1] - 11:23 people [2] - 4:7 overbreadth [1] - 14:5 perceived [1] - 21:5 overbroad [1] - 13:10 percent[1] - 15:6 overinclusiveness [1] perfect [2] - 37:8, 38:5 perfectly [1] - 5:23 perhaps [1] - 10:10 period [3] - 9:12, 10:13, 17:14 permission [1] - 12:11

person [3] - 6:21, 18:22, 38:10 personal [2] - 31:21, 32:16 perspective[1] - 19:9 pertinent [2] - 30:22, 30:23 Pharma [1] - 2:24 Pharmaceutical [1] -2:23 Pharmaceuticals [2] -2:23, 5:1 Philadelphia [2] -1:18, 2:16 phone [6] - 4:5, 4:7, 6:18, 6:23, 19:8, 38:11

pick[1] - 6:1 Piedmont [1] - 2:22 PIETRAGALLO [1] -2:18 Pittsburgh [1] - 2:19 **place** [1] - 23:12 plaintiff [5] - 4:13, 12:19, 13:9, 14:1, 25:17 Plaintiff [7] - 1:12, 1:15, 1:18, 2:4, 2:7, 2:10, 2:13 plaintiffs [22] - 6:9, 7:21, 8:2, 9:1, 9:11, 9:18, 11:13, 12:24, 13:10, 14:2, 14:3, 21:1, 21:10, 24:21, 25:7, 25:19, 26:11, 26:13, 27:7, 34:2, 36:16, 37:18 plaintiffs' [4] - 11:18, 21:23, 23:12, 36:12 platforms [1] - 16:24 pleading [1] - 5:2 PLLC [1] - 2:11 point [8] - 11:10, 13:4, 13:21, 13:22, 19:17, 22:10, 24:18, 29:13 portions [3] - 30:14, 30:18, 32:16 portrayed[1] - 21:3 position [1] - 24:19 positive [1] - 15:6 positives [1] - 22:21 possible[1] - 14:17 possibly [1] - 32:20 potentially [1] - 34:14 practice [3] - 13:21, 16:20, 23:20 precisely [4] - 20:12, 20:13, 21:18, 22:6 prefer [2] - 23:24, 28:25 prejudicial [1] - 16:10 preliminarily [1] -10:15 prepare [1] - 14:22 prepared [3] - 13:25, 38:4 present[1] - 15:11 **PRESENT**[1] - 3:9 presented [1] - 17:1 presumably [1] - 34:9 pretty [1] - 23:11 pricing [1] - 6:8 principally [1] - 29:8 priorities [1] - 6:9 prioritization [1] problem [4] - 18:6,

18:8, 19:16, 36:24 procedure [10] - 15:3, 15:12, 15:14, 17:17, 18:24, 19:3, 19:6, 19:20, 20:1, 20:5 proceed [1] - 18:12 Proceedings [1] -1:21 proceedings [1] -38:17 process [10] - 7:24, 8:23, 16:17, 16:25, 19:11, 22:5, 22:14, 22:18, 22:22, 25:11 processing [1] - 18:14 **produce** [4] - 6:7, 9:10, 10:18, 11:25 produced [2] - 1:22, 23:8 producing [3] - 10:21, 17:12, 18:14 product[1] - 10:21 production [13] - 6:10, 9:21, 10:3, 10:7, 10:23, 11:5, 11:20, 11:24, 13:16, 23:2, 24:8, 24:10 productions [4] -6:12, 6:14, 10:10, 16:22 productive [1] - 36:16 **PRODUCTS**[1] - 1:3 progress [1] - 5:22 proposal [4] - 26:12, 28:19, 30:19, 34:23 propose [1] - 31:16 proposed [11] - 16:17, 19:12, 19:13, 23:10, 27:13, 29:10, 29:21, 30:3, 33:23, 33:24 proposing [3] - 33:5, 33:18, 38:1 protocol [3] - 15:8, 15:14, 22:4 provide [1] - 26:4 provided [3] - 13:9, 14:2, 14:12 punished [1] - 24:25 Punta [1] - 2:6 purpose [1] - 18:24 pursuant[1] - 17:22 put[3] - 16:23, 23:12,

Q

23:19

questions [3] - 12:5, 14:16, 16:5 quickly [1] - 8:25 quote [3] - 17:9, 17:14, 20:9

raise [4] - 8:25, 37:4, 37:16, 38:6 raised [5] - 17:21, 21:24, 21:25, 22:3, 35:19

R

raising [3] - 8:24, 15:13, 19:24 ran [2] - 18:25, 20:24 rapidly [1] - 21:24 RASPANTI [1] - 2:18 rather [1] - 33:5

RE [1] - 1:3 re [1] - 4:3 read [7] - 12:4, 14:3,

14:25, 18:3, 18:13, 21:10, 21:13 **really** [2] - 10:7, 29:14

reason[1] - 31:16

reasonable [1] - 15:21 rebecca [1] - 37:1 received [6] - 5:16,

9:21, 10:11, 14:4, 26:12, 27:5

recent[2] - 11:19, 30:4

recited [1] - 18:6 recognize [1] - 13:21 recollection [1] -15:18

record [6] - 4:2, 5:14, 7:3, 7:5, 14:22, 38:17

recorded [1] - 1:21 records [1] - 7:7 Redondo [1] - 2:9

reduced [1] - 12:7 referring [3] - 17:7, 26:6

refined [2] - 20:11, 20:22

reflected [1] - 7:14 regarding [4] - 8:7, 9:18, 10:5, 14:22 regurgitate [1] - 16:4 related [1] - 20:17

related [1] - 20:17 relatively [1] - 15:1 relay [1] - 11:12 relevant [9] - 9:12,

10:13, 10:17, 11:3, 11:25, 16:12, 30:6, 32:15

remained [1] - 20:10 remaining [2] - 26:15, 37:7

37:7 renegotiate [1] - 19:18 repeat [5] - 5:9, 22:25, 31:22, 31:23, 31:24 **reply** [3] - 25:19, 28:7, 28:8

reporter[1] - 4:9 Reporter[1] - 1:19 Reporter/

Transcriber[1] - 38:19 **reports**[3] - 10:4,

10:8, 20:17
representative[1] 13:17

request[3] - 12:16, 13:6, 16:20

requests [3] - 6:17, 26:4, 26:25 required [1] - 10:8 resolve [1] - 9:2

resolved [2] - 13:20, 28:2

respect [5] - 8:2, 9:19, 20:20, 21:14, 22:10 respond [1] - 25:17 responding [1] -

12:12 response [5] - 13:3, 18:10, 27:1, 28:8, 37:12

responsive [2] -14:17, 23:2 resulting [1] - 17:13

results [2] - 12:17, 22:18

retailer [7] - 5:5, 28:4, 28:5, 31:4, 31:14, 31:15, 33:10 retailer-specific [2] -

28:5, 31:4 retailers [4] - 30:24, 31:3, 31:11, 32:14

revealing [1] - 31:5 review [2] - 9:23, 37:6 reviewing [1] - 17:12 revise [2] - 12:20, 23:4 revised [4] - 25:9.

26:10, 26:11, 36:19 **revision** [1] - 19:10 **revisions** [1] - 13:2

RMR_[1] - 38:19 Road_[1] - 2:22 robust_[1] - 16:19

rolling [5] - 6:10, 6:11, 23:2, 24:8, 25:22

Roseland [1] - 1:12 round [1] - 34:1 Ruben [2] - 4:15, 29:7 RUBEN [1] - 1:17

RUBENSTEIN[2] - 2:21, 5:10

Rubenstein [1] - 5:10

Ruecka[1] - 37:1 Rule[3] - 29:12, 29:17, 30:1 rule[1] - 31:8 ruled [1] - 15:1 rules [2] - 34:5, 35:23 rulings [1] - 38:9 run [4] - 12:18, 17:2, 20:21, 21:15

S

running [1] - 13:14

sales [1] - 6:7 sampling [2] - 15:22, 16:12 **SARAH**[1] - 3:2 **Sarah** [1] - 5:5 sartan[1] - 38:1 saw [2] - 18:15, 26:21 schedule [4] - 6:17, 23:23, 27:11, 37:11 scheduled [2] - 6:11, 6:19 schedules [1] - 38:9 **SCHNEIDER**[1] - 1:8 Schneider [2] - 29:4. 34:19 scratch [1] - 19:17 search [36] - 6:16, 7:23, 8:3, 12:3, 12:7, 12:16, 12:20, 13:1, 13:2, 13:8, 13:24, 14:23, 14:24, 15:19, 15:21, 16:9, 17:2, 17:11, 17:14, 19:1, 19:11, 20:5, 20:8, 20:16, 20:21, 21:15, 22:13, 22:21, 23:4, 23:16, 25:2, 25:3, 25:9, 25:15, 25:17 searches [6] - 12:18, 13:14, 20:24, 24:23, 25:6 searching [1] - 18:25 second[2] - 18:2, 27:16 section [1] - 32:15 sections [2] - 32:15, 32:18 see [7] - 6:22, 11:2, 11:4, 13:20, 28:12, 28:22, 36:19 seller [1] - 31:3 send [1] - 38:4 sense [4] - 30:10. 31:20, 33:5, 35:20 sensible [1] - 30:8 sent [2] - 18:7, 26:23 separate [2] - 30:15,

33:6 **September** [1] - 6:12 serve [1] - 34:6 served[1] - 21:11 set [13] - 7:9, 7:23, 9:12, 10:15, 10:17, 11:4, 11:7, 11:23, 16:9, 17:22, 26:12, 35:14 Seth [4] - 4:24, 11:9, 22:9, 33:14 **SETH**[1] - 2:15 setting [1] - 26:9 settle [1] - 33:9 **Shah** [1] - 11:15 share [1] - 32:1 sheet [1] - 36:13 sheets [4] - 26:2, 26:6, 26:10, 26:11 short [3] - 36:25, 37:3, 37:5 shortly [1] - 38:4 show [2] - 25:16, 36:22 showed [1] - 15:9 shown [1] - 20:11 shut[1] - 16:20 similarly [2] - 30:2, 31:3 **simply** [1] - 22:12 simultaneously [1] -17:12 single [2] - 29:17, 29:25 situation [2] - 5:24, 37:10 six [1] - 19:14 **SLATER** [11] - 1:10, 1:11, 4:14, 8:9, 8:14, 14:6, 15:16, 18:1, 26:19, 26:23, 37:18 **Slater** [7] - 4:14, 8:9, 8:13, 14:6, 15:16, 17:5, 26:18 Slater's [2] - 15:4, 15:8 small [1] - 12:21 **SMITH** [5] - 5:13, 29:4, 34:19, 36:6, 36:9 **Smith** [3] - 3:10, 5:14, 34:21 someone [2] - 13:8, 24:13 soon [1] - 38:9 sorry [5] - 5:10, 18:19, 27:22, 33:14, 34:19 sort [5] - 8:6, 10:12, 15:7, 15:8, 23:16 sound [1] - 9:3 South [1] - 2:9

speaking [1] - 26:24 specific [10] - 12:8, 16:1, 16:5, 19:1, 24:18, 26:4, 28:1, 28:5, 31:4 **specifically** [1] - 20:18 spelled [1] - 22:5 stage [1] - 13:19 stand [2] - 20:10, 32:8 stand-alone [2] -20:10, 32:8 standalone [4] -17:16, 20:8, 20:13, 20:22 start [5] - 5:20, 6:11, 16:25, 23:2, 25:21 started [2] - 10:20, 22:2 starting [1] - 19:17 STATES [2] - 1:1, 1:8 states [2] - 20:9, 20:19 status [2] - 4:4, 7:16 statutes [1] - 31:3 stay [3] - 22:25, 23:4, 23:13 stenography [1] -1:21 stick[1] - 25:24 still [4] - 5:23, 9:14, 10:2, 26:2 stone [1] - 23:3 **stop** [1] - 33:3 straight[1] - 30:16 streamline [1] - 33:1 Street [5] - 1:17, 2:3, 2:6, 2:16, 3:6 string [1] - 21:15 strongly [1] - 24:12 submit [3] - 13:13, 21:20, 36:21 submitted [5] - 12:15. 12:19, 12:24, 22:3, 22:6 **substantial** [1] - 16:8 substantive [2] - 9:19, 10:5 sufficient [1] - 14:13 **suggestion** [1] - 24:13 suite [1] - 3:6 Suite [5] - 1:14, 1:17, 2:12, 2:22, 3:3 **summarize**[1] - 6:5 supplement[1] -18:17 Supply [1] - 31:2 supply [8] - 27:25, 28:3, 31:8, 31:17,

32:6, 32:10, 34:14,

support [1] - 14:4

35:22

supported [2] - 13:4, 13:22 supportive[1] - 12:16 suppose [2] - 33:19, 36:13 supposed [3] - 7:10, 16:22, 18:13 surely [1] - 25:5 surprise[1] - 16:18 suspect[2] - 8:1, 17:23 system [1] - 7:9

T

talks [3] - 17:15, 20:6, 20:8 target [1] - 6:13 technical [1] - 14:16 telephone [1] - 1:5 **TELEPHONE** [1] - 4:1 **term** [3] - 19:2, 21:16, 25:2 terms [49] - 6:9, 6:17, 7:23, 8:3, 12:3, 12:7, 12:17, 12:20, 13:8, 13:24, 14:23, 14:24, 15:19, 15:21, 15:24, 16:9, 17:2, 17:12, 17:14, 17:16, 17:17, 17:18, 19:1, 19:11, 20:5, 20:8, 20:10, 20:13, 20:17, 20:18, 20:21, 20:22, 21:8, 21:9, 21:12, 21:14, 22:7, 22:13, 22:16, 22:21, 23:4, 23:5, 23:16, 25:3, 25:9, 25:15, 25:17, 35:8 test[1] - 22:16 tested [2] - 20:11, 20:22 testing [4] - 15:8, 15:18, 15:22, 16:13 Teva [5] - 2:23, 2:23, 5:11, 12:25, 14:9 **THE** [2] - 1:1, 1:8 The court [86] - 4:2, 4:9, 4:22, 5:3, 5:9, 5:12, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:12, 8:15, 9:1, 9:3, 9:16, 10:14, 11:17, 11:22, 11:24, 12:2, 13:7, 13:23, 14:1, 14:8, 14:19, 15:3, 16:20, 17:4, 17:7, 18:7, 18:20, 19:21, 19:23, 21:1, 21:20, 22:7, 22:11, 22:23, 22:24, 22:25,

23:9, 23:13, 24:3, 24:14, 24:15, 25:11, 25:13, 26:1, 26:7, 26:8, 26:17, 26:20, 27:4, 27:9, 27:22, 27:24, 28:6, 28:13, 28:17, 28:22, 29:2, 29:10, 30:9, 30:12, 31:5, 31:12, 31:14, 32:7, 32:12, 32:24, 33:2, 33:3, 33:16, 34:3, 34:11, 34:18, 35:14, 35:21, 36:7, 36:10, 36:24, 37:4, 37:8, 37:23, 37:24, 38:5 themselves [2] -14:11, 29:21 thereafter [1] - 6:11

thinking [4] - 28:15, 28:17, 28:18, 28:19 **THORNBURG** [1] - 3:2 threading [1] - 16:15 three [23] - 27:17, 27:20, 28:12, 28:20, 28:23, 29:1, 29:11, 30:14, 30:15, 30:17, 30:20, 31:25, 32:14, 32:18, 32:23, 32:25, 33:7, 33:25, 34:22, 35:16, 35:21 timeframe [3] - 10:17, 11:3, 11:25 today [7] - 4:3, 7:2,

together [2] - 23:24, 34:1 took [2] - 23:10, 38:2 total [13] - 28:20, 28:23, 28:25, 29:1, 30:4, 30:7, 33:24, 34:15, 34:22, 35:9, 35:12, 35:16

9:21, 10:11, 14:18,

24:3, 24:4

touch [5] - 6:22, 7:25, 8:5, 11:12, 36:7 **TPP**[1] - 29:24 track[1] - 6:1 transcript[2] - 1:22, 38:16 transcription [1] -1:22

transcripts [1] - 14:25 translated [1] - 8:3 translation [2] - 7:21, 8:10

Traurig [1] - 5:11 TRAURIG [1] - 2:21 **Trischler** [9] - 5:1,

12:11, 16:19, 17:4,

18:21, 19:12, 19:21, 19:23, 23:19 TRISCHLER [8] -2:18, 4:25, 12:10, 13:12, 19:22, 23:25, 24:11, 25:25 trulv [1] - 31:2 trust[1] - 28:11 try [2] - 11:13, 26:13 trying [5] - 8:23, 19:18, 30:15, 34:15, 35:24 twice [1] - 22:19 two [8] - 6:25, 7:18, 7:19, 10:16, 10:18, 11:3, 23:24, 36:4 type [1] - 29:15

U

ULMER[1] - 3:5 ultimately [2] - 16:3, 16:8 unanticipated [1] -23:17 under [2] - 15:11, 35:23 understandable[1] -5:23 understandably [1] -5:21 understood [1] -25:25 undisputed [2] -17:13, 23:7 unforeseen [2] -23:15, 37:12 unfortunately [1] -13:19 unique [2] - 28:4, 31:2 **UNITED** [2] - 1:1, 1:8 unless [1] - 27:3 unnecessary [2] -13:16, 29:14 unusual [2] - 5:24, 33:4 **up** [14] - 6:2, 7:9, 7:16, 10:15, 13:4, 14:20, 15:9, 19:5, 25:5, 29:2, 30:5, 33:20, 33:25, 34:25 **upcoming** [1] - 6:5 USA [1] - 2:23 utilize [1] - 22:17

V

VALSARTAN[1] - 1:3 Valsartan [1] - 4:3 various [1] - 8:21

vendor's [1] - 16:24 verifying [1] - 36:11 versus [1] - 9:20 Via [1] - 1:5 VIA [1] - 4:1 via [1] - 4:5 Vine [1] - 3:6 virtually [1] - 19:18

volume[1] - 12:25

Z

ZHP[13] - 2:17, 4:23, 7:20, 8:21, 22:10, 22:12, 22:19, 24:18, 24:23, 25:5, 25:10, 37:2 **ZHP's**[1] - 18:23

W

wait [1] - 16:5 waiting [1] - 10:2 **WALEKO**[1] - 2:15 Wang [2] - 25:4 Wangs [1] - 25:5 wants [7] - 4:11, 18:17, 24:14, 31:12, 31:14, 35:14, 35:21 warn [1] - 38:2 warranty [1] - 32:23 Wednesday [1] - 1:6 week [4] - 6:24, 11:20, 27:7, 36:17 weeks [3] - 8:22, 10:1, 23:24 weigh [3] - 22:10, 24:16, 24:17 WHITELEY [5] - 2:2, 2:2, 4:18, 37:20, 37:24 Whitely [2] - 4:19, 37:20 wholesale[1] - 19:10 wholesaler [5] - 28:3, 28:4, 31:13, 33:11 wholesalers [5] - 5:8, 30:23, 30:25, 31:2, 31:10 WILLIAMSON [2] -2:5, 4:16 **Williamson** [1] - 4:17 wondering [2] - 29:13, 29:19 **WRIGHT**[3] - 11:14, 11:19, 12:1 Wright [2] - 11:14, 11:17 write [1] - 34:25

Y

year[1] - 10:22 years[1] - 16:17 yellow[2] - 21:12, 21:16 yesterday[1] - 21:11